

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,272	KING, LISE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrea M. Valenti	3643	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Pending

 (1) Andrea M. Valenti.

(3) _____.

 (2) William Collard.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 March 2005 + 24 May 2005
Time: _____.

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1-20

Prior art documents discussed:

U.S. Patent No. 5,113,793; U.S. Patent No. 5,335,618; U.S. Patent No. 1,561,658; U.S. Patent No. 6,584,937.

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner called applicant to follow-up to the previous phone discussion on 15 March 2005. Examiner inquired if applicant would be willing to include additional structural limitations into the independent claim to distinguish over the teachings of the cited art. The recommendation included: the netting cover the entire length of the enclosure with fabric over half of the netting; that there are two handles on the enclosure one running the length of the exposed netting and the other running the length of the fabric from one arched support to another arched support; the frame has rear vertical members that intersect with a pair of arched side members; that the tray/bottom is in the same horizontal plane as the wheels. Applicant was not interested in amending the claims further at this time. Examiner indicated that a Final Rejection would be issued...